

P27

App. F. IX-4

1930-31

File No. 246-30.

Previous References

(Muz)

Serial Nos. 1-4, 5.

Later References

## General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. Four Five.

Part B for April 1932.

### SUBJECT.

Appeal petition filed by Mr. R. Srinivasan on behalf of his client Ramanna appellants, against the order of the Muz. Commr. re. the puja in the Uthsavamba Temple Chitaldrug in Muz appeal no. 35/28-29

ordered that there are no reasons to interfere with the decision of the M.C. and that the Appeal is accordingly dismissed.

to Muz. Commr.  
Mr. Somasekharam  
" S. D. Gangahadras  
Advocates.

No. 1423 of 9.4.3  
1424 " 9.4.3  
1425 " 9.4.3

Serial  
No.

1037  
Appeal petition of 20.1.31 filed by Mr. N. Srinivasarao on behalf of his client Ramanna the appellant against the order of the Muzra Commissioner in Appeal No. 35 of 1928-29 in which it is ordered that the Puja work of the Echavamba temple Chitaldrug should be done by rotation by the appellant and the respondents with a request that pending the disposal of the appeal the present arrangement for worshipping Echavamba be continued.

Notes and orders on the P.W.D.

(1) - Presented by the Advocate.  
Put up with reference to any -  
h-ants a stay order.

(2) There are no references here. If  
appe, the connected records will be  
called for from the M.C.

(3) The request for a stay order  
is for all -

(4) The appeal petition is sufficiently  
stamped and in time -

24/1/31  
24/1/31

H. Seeg)

20/1/31

Records may be called for. In view of the last statement at A  
in the last sentence of the order, no stay order is

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

Muz a.

10 of 30-31

12

File No.

266

of 193

General and Revenue  
Secretariat

9-5 MSL  
28/1/31  
Sub with head of 15 for

1) Issue  
✓  
29.1.31

10) Draft II is submd for order  
It is in accordance with order  
of paras 6 and 7.

MSL  
29.1.31

11) Issue  
✓  
29.1.31

No 1722 of 3.2.31 to the Muzrai Commissioner  
forwarding the petition referred  
to therein for submission of records.


No 1723 of 3.2.31 to Mr N. N. N.  
Srinivas a Rao intimating that  
his request for a stay order cannot  
be complied with.

SUB  
10/2/31

Letter no 1265/3031 of 31/3/31  
from the Muzrai Commissioner submitting  
records relating to the Pujar in the  
Kshavamba Temple Chitaldurg.

12) Vice the last sentence of the order given  
by M.C. in Muz April 35/28. 29 order  
file of his case. The counsel engaged  
by Ramanna, appellant in the present  
appeal, appears to have a grievance  
to the arrangement discussed by me.  
It is not clear how the appellant can go  
behind it now.

20.



9-5 MSL  
28/1/31  
After order if the case may ~~now~~ be posted for clearing  
H. Secy) A. M. S.  
Muz 14/4/31

Serial  
No.

Appeal petition of 24.4.31 filed by  
Mr. Somashekara Rao Advocate  
Bangalore city on behalf of his  
client Ramanna, archak  
of the Sri Utsavaamba Temple  
Chitalongy prajuly for a stay  
order in the case referred to  
therein and requesting that the  
petitioner be permitted to do  
duties connected with the temple.  
(15) Minutes of the first meeting  
of Council on the P. U. D.  
"No Stay order. Appeal  
to be heard soon".

No reply necessary. I have  
informed the lawyer who presented  
this

(16) The previous petition on the subject  
was filed by Mr. Nittur Srinivas Rao  
Advocate Bangalore city. (Hag 5) - &  
the latter has been informed that  
the case has been postponed to Saturday  
the 16<sup>th</sup> of May 1931 -

The present appl. petn. has  
been presented by Mr. Somashekara  
Rao. In order of a notice of the  
date of hearing be sent to the  
latter also.

88 MSK  
29/4

ye  
13  
29.4.

Muz app: 10 23

Muz File No 21

of 1930-1

General and Revenue  
Secretariat

Issued No. 2369 of 29-4-31 to Mr

M- P Somasekhara Rao - Advocate Bangalore

1/3

Case called on 16th May 1931.

The Appellants <sup>was</sup> were represented by

Mr. Somasekhara Rao and the Respondents by Mr. Ganesha

Rao.

1.  
No 1768

Both the Lawyers asked for an adjournment  
which has been allowed. May be posted for hearing  
on the next date.

Muz

16/5/31

18 5 3

Muzrai Temple Ch. B. B. B.

General and Revenue  
Secretariat

App. F. III-2]

Muz.

File No.

246

of 193 0

Serial  
No.

4326

714  
2877

Case heard on 27th July 1931.

21) The Appellant was ~~re~~ represented by his  
Lawyer Mr. M.P. Somasekhara Rao and the Respondents  
by Mr. S.D. Ganesha Rao.

22) There is no need to interfere with the  
orders passed by the Muzrai Commissioner. The  
Appellant's Lawyer, however, represented that  
his ~~own~~ client might be allowed the right of <sup>in addition to his own for 6-7</sup>  
worship in the temple on Hechukatle days. It is  
stated that this arrangement obtained during the  
life time of his client's father. The Counsel  
for the Respondents was agreeable to this arrange-  
ment, and the two lawyers have <sup>offered</sup> agreed to consult  
their clients and report their agreement on this  
point. If a report of this kind is received, the  
Muzrai Commissioner's order might be upheld with  
this addition.

Subject to the  
condition that the  
Hechukatle functions are  
attended to by both  
parties in stead of only  
by the Appellant


Encl. B. 11.9.31

15.9.31

confidential  
letter placed  
in sealed cover  
& tagged.

Mr. T. K. Chelvi  
29/9

NOTE—Contn Sheet.



23) The concerned advocates were  
reminded on 28.9.31 to send up a report  
before 18th Nov. 1931. No report has been  
received from either  
of them

Rs

23/1

I Member)

Asst  
28/1

25) Please send another  
reminder

WD 02553—GFB—50,000—8730

null  
25/11/32  
L. 26/1

27/1/51

9

of 1930

General and Revenue  
Secretariat

Issue for  
Aug. 11

OFFICE OF THE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
16 MAR 1939  
5489

msc  
4/12/22 ✓

2) Orders of the Secretary on the P. U. &  
"Muz. Put up file for work of the  
Members!"

accordingly.

The file is subd. A reply from  
the Advocate ~~from~~ Mr. S. D. Gangra  
Rao has not been received.

25/10/1941 Ploofm cross

123  
Frieden)

14/3/32

1<sup>st</sup> member)

h  
15/2 15/3

A. Please write to him and ask him  
to send a report. Early (Mae)


Mr

$$\begin{array}{r} 2 \overline{) 16332} \\ \underline{2} \phantom{00} \\ 16 \mid 3 \mid 32 \end{array}$$

45 MBK 07/11/13  
17/13 35

33) June 2/17/3

Letter no 1296/m of 19.3.32  
to Mr S. D. Ganesh Rao 1882nd.



# Chhatrapati Uthman Temple

App. No. 111-23

General and Revenue  
Secretariat

File No.

of 1931-2

Serial  
No.

Letter of 22/8/32 from Mr S. D.  
Ganesha Rao Advocate Bangalore  
stating that no compromise has been  
effected so far between the parties

The statement made in para 3  
of the P. U. District Clear. The reply to  
the Advocate to Subd for orders with  
ref to the minutes in para 22.

Both the Coms have  
written to say that no compromise  
has been effected. Subd for  
orders.

29/3/32

For Secy

1st meeting

29/3/32

orders may be issued to  
the effect that there are no  
reasons to interfere with the  
decision of the Mut Coms and that  
the appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Min

1/4/32

1/4/32

As per DSK of 22/8/32

For Secy

WD 02553-50,000-GPB-37

For Secy

7/4/32



NOTE - Contn. Sheet

The document is  
of 20/8/32. The Coms have  
stated that no compromise has been  
effected so far between the parties.

File No. 246

of 1930-1

General and Revenue  
Secretariat

Memos no 1423 & 9.4.32 to  
the Muzrai Commissioner  
returning records -

No 1424 and 1425 of 9.4.32  
to Messrs Somashekara Rao  
and S. W. Ganesh Rao  
respective Advocates in the  
Case intimating that the appeal is  
dismissed -

O  
18/4

ಶಿಕ್ಷಾ ಇವು ರೂಪಿಗಳು ೨-೨

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,  
BANGALORE.

Muzrai Appeal No 10 of 1930-31

RAMANNA.

son of Siddalingappa,  
Pujari, Utsavamba Temple  
Chitaldroog.

Appellant

Vs


1. HUTCHAPPA

1st Respondent

2. MAHALINGAPPA

2nd Respondent

Residents of Chitaldrug.



ಮುಖ್ಯ 5-50-5

Under S. 38 of the Mysore Religious and Charitable Endowments Regulation, the Appellant above named begs to prefer this Appeal against the order of the learned Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore Muzrai Appeal No. 35 of 1928-29 directing that the puja in the Uthsavamba temple, should be done by rotation by the Appellant and the Respondents and begs to state as follows:-

The Pujari Hak in the Uthsavamba temple, Chitaldroog, is a hereditary one which has been in the enjoyment of the Appellant's family for many generations. The eldest member of the eldest branch has always succeeded to the office. After the death of the Appellants grandfather the office was registered in the name of the Appellant's father Siddalingappa who was the former's eldest son. Owing to

ಮುಖ್ಯ  
5-50-5

certain domestic circumstances the appellant's father used to entrust the worship of the deity to the respondents ( who are his step-brothers ) for six months in the year and allow them to enjoy the perquisites in lieu of salary to them for performing the work on his behalf. The Appellant's father died in 1926 and after enquiry the Sub-Division Officer ordered that the appellants and the respondent to perform the puja by turns of 4 months each. On Appeal to the Deputy Commissioner, a report was called for and that officer passed an order holding that the appellant was entitled to the entire Hak. Thereupon the respondents appealed to the Muzrai Commissioner who has ordered that the Puja should be done by rotation for six months at a time by the appellant on the one side and the respondents on the other, though at the same time he has ordered the Baraward to be made in the appellant's name only. It is against this order <sup>that</sup> ~~which~~ the appellant has come up in appeal on the following, among other, grounds.

I. The Muzrai Commissioner erred in holding that a domestic arrangement entered into between the appellant's father and the respondents conferred any permanent right on the respondents.

2. The Muzrai Commissioner ought ~~to have~~ not to have treated the appellant's reference to the said arrangement in this appeal before the Deputy Commissioner as an admission adversely affecting his ~~own~~ claim to the entire right.


3. The Muzrai Commissioner has failed to notice that, whatever arrangements might prevail with regard to the actual performance of the worship, the Hak itself was impartible and descended to the eldest member of the eldest branch.


4. Even on ~~admissi~~ administrative grounds the learned Muzrai Commissioner's order is inexpedient especially in view of the very small income accruing to the Pujari.

The appellant, therefore, humbly prays that the learned Muzrai Commissioner's order be set aside and the order of the Deputy Commissioner be restored.

The appellant further prays that, pending the disposal of this appeal, the present arrangement for worshipping Uthsavamba be continued and the order of the learned Muzrai Commissioner be be stayed. Since, the Appellant having been in charge of the office continuously for the last 4 years, any disturbance of the arrangement will cause inconvenience to the devotees.

Bangalore,  
Jan. 20, 1931.

  
Advocate for Appellant.



Before the Muzrai Commissioners  
in Mysore.


Dated, Bangalore, the 13<sup>th</sup> January 1931

Muzrai Appeal no. 35 of 1928-29.

Appellants: - 1. Huchappa 2. Maha-  
leingappa.

Respondent: - Ramanna.

Appeal against the order of the  
Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug  
District, setting aside the order  
directing the worship by rotation  
in the Utsavamba Temple in  
Chitaldrug town and ordering that  
the Baravard be made in the name  
of the respondent Ramanna.



### Facts of the case

The Pujari Hat in the Utsavamba  
Temple, is seen from the records

to be hereditary in the appellants' family. The respondent Ramanna in this case is the step brother's son of the appellants. His father Subbalingappa who was the senior member of the family was appointed Barwardar in 1912 by the Sub Division Officer. The ordinary contingent charges were being paid to him from January 1912 to August 1926. During his lifetime there was no hitch about the right to Pujariship of the temple. The worship was being performed by Subbalingappa and the appellants, in turn, for six months. After his death in 1926, the appellants claimed the Pujariship of the temple along with their nephew Ramanna - the present respondent. The Sub Division Officer ordered that the appellants and the respondent should perform Pujas, by turns, of 4 months each.

The

The respondent not agreeing to this preferred an appeal to the Deputy Commissions, praying that as his father and the appellants were from a long time, performing Pujas by turns of 6 months and that his father himself was attending to all the Hetchukatte ceremonies through out the year, the manhood may be restored. He subsequently presented several petitions to the Deputy Commissions claiming the entire Hak to Pujariship in himself as belonging to the eldest branch of the family. A report having been called for by Deputy Commissions from the sub division office, the latter recommended that the respondent should succeed his father, that others may come in only after the eldest branch becomes ~~extinct~~ extinct and that as the temple had no Inam lands or annuities

Cash grant from Government  
worth the name, no Pujari would  
get sufficient remuneration by  
doing Pujā for 4 months by rotation.  
The Deputy Commissioners agreeing with  
the Sd Division Office, set aside the  
original order of Sd Division Office  
Mr Rudrappa directing the worship  
by rotation and ordered that the  
appellants can have no manner  
of claim to the Office until the  
eldest Branch became extinct  
and that the Baraward should be  
made in the name of the respondent  
(Kumamma). A review petition  
against this order to the Deputy  
Commissioner was rejected on the  
ground that the office of Archak  
was not partible, that if the  
right be split up, in course of  
time, any number of claimants  
may spring up and such a division  
was not conducive to the proper  
and efficient management of the  
affairs

affairs of the Institution and that the appellants might establish their right by way of suit. The present appeal is against this order.


### Order.

I agree with the Deputy Commissioner that the Baraward should be made in the name of the respondent, Ramanna. But, it does not follow from this that any right of the appellants to perform Pujā in conjunction with the respondent should not be recognised, there is evidence of any such rotation in the worship. The records show that even when the respondent's father was the Baraward Pujari, the appellants were doing Pujā by turns. In the circumstances, I see no reason to deprive the appellants of the right to perform the Pujā for some part of the year, and I direct that the Pujā should be done by rotation for 6 months at a time by the respondent.

on the one side, and the appellants  
on the other side, without prejudice  
to the Baraward being made in the  
name of the respondent. Both the Counsel  
who appeared for the two parties seemed to  
be agreeable to this arrangement.

/s/ S. P. Rajagopalachari  
Muzrai Commissioner.

"Copy"



S. Venkateshalingar  
Manager, Office of the  
Muzrai Commissioner  
in Mysore, Bangalore.

Copy applied for on 16-1-1931

do ready on 16-1-1931

do delivered on 17-1-31

No. of words 654

Copyrif fee 0-14-0

Cost of paper 0-0-4


Comparing fee 0-2-4

Copied by Durubee

Compared by S. Sureswaraiah

Copy

Manager  
Muz: Com's Office



62

Before the Government of Mysore Bangalore  
ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿ Muzrai Appeal ಸಂಬಂಧ

ವಾದಿ-ಯಾ-ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್  
Appellant  
Rennanna

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ-ಯಾ-ಅಪೋನೆಂಟ್  
Respondents

1. Hutchappa

} Vs. { 2. Mahalingappa

ಮು: ರಾ|| ನಿಟ್ಟೂರ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ರಾವ್, ಬಿ. ಎಸ್.ಸಿ., ಜಿ. ಎಲ್., ರವರಿಗೆ

Appellant

ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೊನೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆಡಳಿತಗಳನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿ ಕ್ರಮ ನಡೆಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಹಣ ಬಾಕಿಹಣ ಸಹ ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ದಸ್ತವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯನ್ನು ರಾಜೀ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೂ ನಾನು ಸ್ವತಃ ಇದ್ದು ನಡೆಸಿದಂತೆ ಬಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬುದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 17 / 1 / 1951

ರುಜು 6 ಇಕ್ರಾಂ. ಕಾ. ಎಲ್.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತಾರಾನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. } ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತಾರಾನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

MSR

Milton Samuelson

ಎಸ್. ಎಲ್. ಎನ್. ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ೩೬೬-೨೮

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA  
OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

*Uy 246-30-2* No. *1722* *incre file*  
*appeal 3-2-31*  
The accompanying Petition Registered  
No. .... *1037* ..... dated ..... *20.1.31*

received at the General and Revenue  
Secretariat from *Mr. Ramanna* Son of  
*Viddalingappa* *Pujari*  
*Utsavamba Temple Chitaldon*  
*in the matter of the Pujari*  
*here in the Utsavamba*  
*Temple, Chitaldon*

is forwarded, together with its enclosures  
to the *M.C.* .....

..... for *Submission*  
*A record connected with*  
*the case together with a*  
*report on the points raised*  
*in the petition*  
By Order,  
*19.1.31*  
For Secretary. *(Signature)*

BANGALORE,

..... *25/1/1931* }

[P. T. O.]

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರಿ.....ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು  
.....ಹೋಬಳಿ  
.....ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ  
.....ಗೆ

ಇಂಡಾಸ್ಟ್ರಿ ಹುಕ್ಕು.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡ ..... .

ಮರ್ಕು ಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು..... ಬಗ್ಗೆ

.....  
.....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

Secretary.

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat  
( )  
the 193 .

Date of issue..... 3/2/31

Signed by..... *M V S G. S. S.*

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section

File No. 246-30

Serial No. 3

No. 1723

*incase  
file*

To

*Nittan Nairavasara*  
B. Secy B. L.

Advocate.

Bangalore city

Sir,

In the reference appeal  
pet<sup>n</sup> of 20/1/31 filed by  
you on behalf of one  
Ramanra son of  
Siddalingappa Pujari  
Uthavamba temple  
Chitaldang in the  
conduct of worship  
made in the temple  
of the temple referred to above  
I am directed to state  
[over]

That your request for a stay  
order ~~in matter~~ can not be  
Complied with

I have see

172  
179.1.31

For See to you

H. Sepor

1724 of 5/2/31  
Copy to m.c. for information.

O.B.-O

172  
179.

For See to you

H. Sepor

9.8  
128/1/31


1265-  
20-31-23

246-30-4  
OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER  
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 14th March 1931.  
31<sup>st</sup>


FROM

S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI, Esq., B.A., B.L.,  
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.



TO

Rajasevaparayana  
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,  
Secretary to Government of His Highness  
the Maharaja of Mysore,  
Financial Department.



SIR,

506  
X X  
With reference to your official memorandum No.1722/246-30-2 dated 3rd February 1931 calling for submission of records relating to the Puja in the Utsavamba temple, Chitaldrug, I have the honor to forward herewith the entire records received from the Deputy Commissioner Chitaldrug District, together with this office File-Appl.35/28-29 and to state that the facts of the case are fully set forth in this office order No.Appl.35/28-29 dated 13th January 1931.

The appeal petition received with your official memorandum is returned herewith.

I have the honor to be,




S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

*Y. Narasimha Rao*

For Muzrai Commissioner.

(absent from station)



BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

24 APR. 1931 Muzarai Appeal No. 10 of 1930- 1931.

---:0:---

Appellant:-  
(Petitioner)

ARCHAKA RAMANNA.

--:(VS):--

Respondents:-

(i) Huchappa.

(ii) Mahalingappa.

\*\*\*\*

The Petitioner begs to state as follows : --

(1). The Petitioner who is the baravardar of the Pujari Office of Utsavamba Temple - Chitaldroog has filed this appeal against an order of the Muzarai Commissioner in Muzarai Appeal Number 35 of 1928 - 1929 directing that the puja in the said temple be performed each by the petitioner and the respondents by rotation for six months at a time. He had prayed for an order of the Stay of Execution in his appeal petition but that prayer was not then granted.

(2). The Petitioner submits that the

- Office

No stay order.  
Appeal to be  
heard 1st  
Muz  
24.4.31  
No reply necessary.  
Have informed  
the lawyer  
who presented  
this.

=(2)=

Office being registered in his name  
and duties and perquisites being -  
inalienable and impartible , the order  
of the Muzarai Commissioner is Prima facie  
erroneous.

(3). The Muzarai Commissioner  
has not given due consideration to the  
fact that the Office/<sup>is</sup>not sufficiently -  
lucrative and that consequently a -  
partition of the same by directing the  
performance of its duties by rotation is highly  
*in*expedient besides being illegal.

(4). Apart from the merits of the  
case, it is submitted that the consequence of  
giving effect to the order under appeal  
would be to cause serious and ~~imparable~~ <sup>irreparable</sup> injury  
to the petitioner who in the event of his -  
succeeding in the appeal can in no way be  
compensated for the resulting loss of -  
income which will be all the greater since  
the annual jatra is to begin from to-day  
(24-4-1931).

(5). It will be seen that the  
Muzrai Commissioner has in his order relied

-on the

=(3)=

on the alleged usage during the petitioners life time which was merely a temporary domestic arrangement which could confer no sort of permanent right on the respondents. But it is clear from the materials on record that even under the said arrangement all duties in connection with important or extraordinary functions such as Jatras Dasara, Sivaratri etc. , were being done by the petitioner's father himself as the Baravardar and the representative of the elder branch.

(6). The Local Authorities have deprived the petitioner of the charge of the Office and -put the respondents in charge. They refuse to permit the petitioner to perform any duties in connection with the Jatra which is to commence from to - day (24-4-1931).

(7). In the circumstances the petitioner is bound to suffer serious loss by reason of the order under -

appeal

=(4)=

under appeal being enforced. It is ,  
therefore in the interests of Justice  
that the execution of the said order  
should be stayed.

'8). The Petitioner prays that  
the execution of the order under appeal  
be stayed and the petitioner be put  
back in charge and that in any case  
the petitioner be permitted to perform  
all duties connected with the Jatra.

B A N G A L O R E, (  
24th A p r i l 1931.) )


ಗಣೇಶ್ ಎ. ಮುಷ್ಕೆ  
Petitioner.  
-----

*M. Gomankhara Rao*

Advocate for Petitioner.

=====

\*\*\*\*



In the Court of the *ಶ್ರೀ ಮಹಾಶಯ*

*Muz.*

CASE No.

OF 1930-1931

Appellant, Plaintiff.

Respondent, Defendant.

*Ramanna*

VS

1. *Huckappa*  
2. *Mahalingappa*

1. *I* the *Attorney* - *above*named do by these presents retain MR *M. S. Somashekar* .., Advocate, to appear in and conduct the above case on... *my*... behalf to judgment

2. *I*... further empower him to execute any decree or order that may be passed in *my*... behalf and to receive from Court all documents, refunds and such sums of money as *I*... may be entitled to get and grant receipts therefor

3. *I*... also undertake to confirm and ratify all the legal acts done by him in so doing.

BANGALORE

..... 12-4..... 1931 }

*ಶ್ರೀ ಮಹಾಶಯ*

Accepted

*M. S. Somashekar*

Signed before me and personally

known to me.

*M. S. Somashekar*

Advocate for

Advocate



Before the Government of ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.  
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore  
ಸಂ. Bangalore 19 - 19

Muzrai Appeal No. 10 of 1930-31

ಪಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪೂರನಂಟ್.

Ramanna

Hutchappa

Vs.

Mahalingappa

ಮಾ|| ರಾ|| ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್ ~~ಬಾ|| ರಾ|| ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್~~  
S D Ganesha Rao B.A.B.  
Advocate  
Cubbonpet Bangalore City  
Respondents - ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ ನಾಮಾ.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಸಂಬರ್ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನಿವಾದಿಸಿ  
ಫೈಸಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ, ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧವಟ್ಟ ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ  
ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಕ್ಕಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಸಹ ವಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ರಸೀತಿ  
ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಗಾಗಿ ವಾಪಸು ಆಗುವ ದಾಮಾ ಸ್ವಾಂಪು, ಪ್ರೋಸೆಸ್ ಸ್ವಾಂಪು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರಿ  
ಸ್ವಾಂಪು ಸಹ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಬಾಬ್ತು ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ದಸ್ತೆವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ  
ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಅಥವಾ  
ತನಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ನಡೆಸುವ ಕೆಲಸಗನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾನು ಖುಷ್ತು ಇದ್ದು ನಡೆಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲು  
ಇವರಿಂದ ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದೇನೆ.

ತಾ|| ... .. } ರುಜು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ

ಅರ್ಜಿ ತ ಮಹ ಅಂಸ ಪು  
Respondents

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆ ನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತು  
ರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜುಮಾಡಿರುವರೆಂದು  
ನಾನು ಸರ್ತಿಪ್ಪೆ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.  
W. Channarayanaiah  
Karachi Shannalal  
Chitralal

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆ ನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದೇನೆ  
S D Ganesha Rao  
ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್ 16/5/31

SUBJECT .....

C. F. H.

Section 742

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 446  
447

To

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 28.9.31

(1) M. P. Somasakharu Rao  
Advocate(2) S. D. Ganesh Rao  
Advocate

Signed by Mr V. S.

Subject: - Muz Abpt No

10 of 30-31 about the

right to area of  
the Antheavamba  
temple - Chitalong,

Su.

I am directed to state

That a report of

between the parties in  
the above case is  
promised by you at the heavy cost of

List of enclosures .....

Report called for will  
be answered till 1-12-31

Copied by A. Appad.

G. S. M. (H. Leary) VS  
5/11 5.11.31

Examined by

You kindly report the  
same before 18<sup>th</sup> Nov 1931.

I have etc.

~~17<sup>th</sup>~~  
17<sup>th</sup> Nov 1931  
Yours truly  
H. D. D.

25/9  
25/9

SUBJECT .....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to ..... <sup>✓</sup> 1430

No 1047-8

To

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue ..... 30.11.32

Signed by ..... Muz A. Subba Rao

1) M P Samasellam Rao Esq  
Advocate Chikpeel  
Bangalore city

(2) S-D. Ganesh Rao Esq  
Advocate, Chikpeel  
Bangalore city.

Subject: Muz appl no 10 of  
30-31 about the right to the  
Archaeology of the Sri & Savanba  
temple - Chikpeel.

Hi,

I am directed to inform  
ref<sup>d</sup> to the office letter nos.  
446-447/13 <sup>Muz</sup> 28/9/31 encl,  
for the report of agreement etc.

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

the parties in the

and to request you to be paid

to send this

as to forward his state <sup>early</sup> ~~when~~ at a very early

~~the same may be copied in this office~~

~~you kind reply is requested~~

Thank you

27/11


For Sec to Govt

18/12/11

68

27/11

P. SOMASEKHARA RAO, B.A., LL.B. CHIKKAPET, BANGALORE CITY.  
ADVOCATE



To,

The Secretary to the Government of  
His Highness the Maharaja of  
Mysore.

Financial Department.

Subject: Muz. Appeal No.10 of 1930-31  
about the right to the Archaka-  
-ship of the Sri Utsavamba -  
Temple, Chitaldroog.

S i r,

Re. your letter No.1047-8/Muz. -  
dated 29/30th Jan 1932, I beg to state  
that after communicating with the appella-  
-nt I learn that the parties have been  
unable to arrive at any agreement in -  
regard to the matters in controversy in  
the case. I therefore, pray that the  
Appeal be disposed off on the merits.

I regret delay in replying to your  
letter. But the same was unavoidable as  
I had to communicate with the parties be-  
-fore replying your letter.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient Servant,

*P. Somasekhara Rao*

No. 1296/27

17th March 1932.

194-


The

Mr. S. D. Ganesha Rao,  
Advocate, Cubbonpet,  
Bangalore City.

Subject :- Muzrai appeal No. 10 of 30-31 about the  
right to Archakship of the Sri Utsavamba  
temple, Chitaldrug.

I am directed to invite your kind attention to  
this office letters Nos. 447 dated 28th September 1931 and  
1047-8 dated 30th January 1932 on the above subject and  
to request you to intimate by return of post if an --  
understanding on the lines agreed to by you on 27th  
July 1931 has been arrived at between the parties in  
the above case.

Yours faithfully,

  
For Financial Secretary to Govt.

S.S.

MK.2.

T .....

Section *my*

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. *1296/My*

To

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the

193 .

*Mr. S. D. Ganesh Rao**Advocate - Calcutta**Bangalore city*

Date of issue

*19<sup>th</sup> March 1932 - R.**Subj: - My App no 10 of 30-31  
about the right to Arrears  
of the in Retardation of the  
this along**I am directed to write*

Signed by

*Mr. B. Muddappa**your attention**to this office letters nos**447 of 28/9/31 + 1047-8 of**30/1/32 on the above**Subject and to request you  
to ~~initiate to return of post~~  
to ~~reply report~~ of an**Amicable understanding  
on the basis agreed to by you on 27.7.31  
has been arrived at between*

List of enclosures .....



*The parties in the above*

Copied by

*11/1/32**Case -*

Examined by .....

*Yours faithfully**17/3/32**For Sec to go**27 wpm*



Bangalore  
dated 22.3.1932

From-

S.D. Ganesha Rao Babu  
Advocate, Cubbonpet  
Bangalore city

To

The Financial Secretary to the  
Government of His Highness  
The Maharaja of Mysore.

Sir,

I am in receipt of  
your communication dated  $\frac{17}{19}$ -3-1932  
regarding Mugrai Appeal No. 10 of 30-31  
about the right to Archakship of the Sri  
utsavaamba Temple, Chitaldroog.  
I regret to inform you that  
no compromise has been effected bet-  
ween the parties.

An offer was made to abide  
by the arrangement which was agreed to  
by the appellant himself, which he has  
admitted in his application to the lower  
court. The order of the learned Revenue  
commissioner has just recognised the  
above arrangement and has not done  
anything more. Even this the appellant  
is not willing to concede.

My clients are not anxious  
to ask for more. They will be content  
with the old arrangement.

The records bear out my  
statement. If there is any difficulty  
in laying one's hand on the exact doc-  
ument

Before the Government of His Highness the  
Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 10 of 1930-31

Appellant.

Vs

Respondents

Ramanna

Hutakappa  
Mahalingappa-

Subject.

Appeal against the decision of the M-C  
in my ~~case~~ <sup>Appeal No. 35/28-29</sup> on the file of this  
Court concerning the Puja in Sri Utsavamba  
Temple Chithaldurga be done by rotation for  
six months at a time ~~by the~~ with an  
prejudice to the barward being made  
in the name of Ramanna.

~~Case.~~  
The Case was heard on 27<sup>th</sup> July 1931. The  
The Appellant was represented by Mr. M. P. Sankararam  
Advocate ~~representing~~  
Rao, and the respondents were represented  
by Mr. S. D. Ganesh Rao - Advocate.  
On the request of the Advocate time was granted  
to effect an amicable understanding  
between the parties and they were asked  
to report the result of action taken.

maybe  
deleted  
4/2/14

acc been able  
a mean time has ha  
~~on its merits~~  
~~order~~ order.

There are no reasons ~~to~~ <sup>in</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~decision~~ <sup>decision</sup> of the m.c. ~~and~~ The appeal  
is accordingly ~~dismissed~~ <sup>dismissed</sup>.

no 1424/mz of 9.11.32-

Copy to Mr. M. P. Somasudhan Rao. Advocate  
Chennai Bangalore city.  
B-O

no 1425/mz of 9.4.32

Copy to Mr. S. D. Ganesh Rao. Advocate  
Chennai Bangalore city -  
B-O

no 1423/mz of 9/4/32 <sup>See below</sup>  
End. on record <sup>7/4/32</sup> <sup>7/4/32</sup>

Copy to the m.c. returning records received  
with his letter no 1265 of 31.3.31.  
30-31  
B-O

Go  
574

<sup>See below</sup>  
7/4/32 <sup>7/4/32</sup>